

means lives. If the United Nations can move more quickly, we can prevent future disasters in places like Somalia, Rwanda, and Bosnia.

There is a second lesson to be learned.

If the United States is to play a responsible role of leadership in the community of nations, some risks must be taken, and when there are regrettable casualties within our Armed Forces, we must stay our course.

Those who enlist for service in the Chicago Police Department know they will be performing a public service, but they also know they will be taking a risk. If some drug smugglers or gang leaders in a neighborhood kill two policemen, the mayor of Chicago will not announce that that area of the city will no longer have police protection because of the casualties.

Somalia illustrates our problem.

Mistakes were made, primarily by a U.S. military man put in charge of part of a U.N. mission for which he had little background. He looked for military answers to problems rather than the diplomatic answers that Ambassador Robert Oakley had adeptly been fashioning.

But when a U.S. serviceman's body was dragged through the streets by teenage thugs, when that man went to Somalia on a humanitarian mission, the American people were appalled, and there were cries in Congress to pull out all our troops immediately.

At that point, we had a new President inexperienced in international relations facing a volatile Congress. Some calming words of explanation to the American people would have been appropriate, explaining that if local terrorists can cause a few American casualties, and we flee the scene, the example will not go unnoticed by others around the world wherever American troops are stationed.

The reality is that fewer American service personnel were killed in Somalia than cabdrivers were killed in New York City that year. That does not make any of the deaths less tragic. But those who enter the Armed Forces must understand that, like the Chicago Police enlistees, they are taking additional risks. And the American people must understand this.

We are in the budget season, discussing whether or not to appropriate money for certain fancy weapons systems. What other nations question is not the technical proficiency of our weapons but our backbone. And the question is being asked, not about those who serve in the Armed Forces, but about the administration, Congress and the American people. Others look at the weakness of both the Bush and Clinton administrations in Bosnia and they wonder. A few terrorists frighten us out of Somalia, and they wonder about our professed resolve elsewhere.

When several Members of Congress issued calls to get us out of Somalia, the administration first called a meeting of all Members of both Houses at

which Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Secretary of Defense Les Aspin spoke. The meeting was a disaster. Such a large meeting on a volatile subject should never be called; the noisemakers take over.

Then the White House called a smaller meeting with about 20 of us from Congress with all the key administration people present, including the President. The lengthy meeting, held on October 7, 1993, resulted in a compromise that all U.S. troops would be pulled out by March 31. I was not happy with this, but I agreed to the compromise because it was considerably better than an immediate pull-out.

A few days after the White House meeting, President Mubarak of Egypt visited the United States, and I went to Blair House to pay a courtesy call on him. Just before I got there, an administration official asked me to urge President Mubarak to keep his Egyptian troops in Somalia after March 31. Without quoting President Mubarak directly, it is not violating any confidence to say that the request to have his nation, with its meager resources, stay in Somalia while the wealthy and powerful United States of America wanted to quietly back out, did not impress him.

We must be careful in using our human and military resources, but when we make the decision to use them—preferably in concert with other nations—we should use those resources with firmness and a reliability that other nations, friendly or unfriendly, sense.

Since U.N. efforts at peacekeeping are in our security interest, would it be asking too much for us to suggest that 1 percent of the defense budget be set aside for support of peace keeping? Far from harming our security needs, that would strengthen the ability of the United Nations to respond quickly to emergencies, and that 1 percent would not harm any defense needs that we have.

It is easy for officeholders of either party to appeal to the fears and hatreds of people, to appeal to the worst in us, to ask us to turn inward rather than reach out.

But if we are serious in our talk about family values, we should urge our citizens to reach beyond the artificial barriers that separate people; to be concerned about one another, then, all families will be more secure. Appeals to shortsighted selfishness do not help a family, and a political call for shortsighted selfishness does no favor to the nation. As leaders, we must appeal to the noble in our people, not the worst, and if we apply that to international relations, the United States will benefit, as will the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous order, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted

to speak as if in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you Mr. President.

THE REMARKS OF SENATOR SIMON

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to say that I hope other Members will have the chance to read what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has offered us today. I gather he will be making a series of such speeches in the days ahead. As always, his remarks are insightful and thoughtful. I am glad I had the opportunity to hear him today.

WHITE HOUSE SPOKESMAN'S DISTURBING REMARK

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to a statement made by President Clinton's chief spokesperson Michael McCurry, as reported in the March 22 Washington Times.

In discussing the Republican Presidential field and candidate Pat Buchanan in particular, Mr. McCurry said: "Mr. Buchanan and his mutaween will be out there parading across America, and we can track them down."

Mr. McCurry's reference is to Saudi religious officers, to whom I gather he is equating American conservatives who are both religious and interested in playing a role in politics.

With this statement, Mr. McCurry has managed no mean feat: he has slurred religious Americans, he has slurred individuals of Arab descent, and he has misused his position as White House spokesman.

Mr. President, I believe it is wrong to attack those who are religious and involved in politics as zealots and extremists. These attacks are unfair, divisive and destructive. They challenge the right to engage in important moral arguments in public life, to everyone's detriment.

People of strong faith always have been involved in politics and their faith has influenced their political action—to America's benefit.

Even before our Nation was founded, people of faith brought Americans together through their eloquent advocacy of religious, moral and political principles. During the Revolutionary War ministers used political sermons to expound and elaborate on Thomas Jefferson's famous words in the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal and "endowed by their creator" with rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They told Americans that it was their religious as well as political duty to protect their rights and the rights of their children and grandchildren by fighting for independence.

These brave ministers established an American political and religious tradition that continued to thrive, through the Civil War and on into this century.

Martin Luther King, Jr., drew on this tradition. He was, of course, the Reverend Martin Luther King—a religious minister. His crusade for racial justice and equality of opportunity drew explicitly on references to God and God's will.

Reverend King called for racial equality, not because some mere philosophical, academic principle demanded it, but because God demands that we treat one another with respect, according to the content of our character and not the color of our skin. In this way he showed Americans their duty toward one another, and brought us together in pursuit of a just equality of opportunity.

Today, however, conservative people of faith are attacked as intolerant extremists for having the temerity to make demands on our conscience. Mr. McCurry's statement is only the latest in such regard. Peaceful pro-life protesters are condemned as religious bigots for opposing what they feel is a great moral crime. The Christian Coalition and other similar groups are often depicted as a dark force whose participation in the political process is somehow inappropriate.

Mr. President, we must reject this kind of antireligious bigotry in whatever form it takes. After all, should Martin Luther King have been dismissed as an intolerant religious fanatic?

I certainly hope not, for that would have denied our country his moral force, which contributed mightily to the civil rights movement's success. Yet Mr. McCurry's apparent disdain for the involvement of people of faith in the political process would surely have kept Reverend King out of politics, unless, of course, such intolerance only applies to conservative people of faith.

I also am concerned about Mr. McCurry's comments because, frankly, I believe that it perpetuates in American public life the stereotype that anyone connected to the Arab world must be an extremist.

As an American of Lebanese descent, I take great exception to Mr. McCurry's use of his White House podium in this fashion. I believe it is inappropriate to employ ethnic-based references or comparisons as a means of insulting or demeaning others.

Arab-Americans have worked hard to assimilate and succeed in America. According to the 1990 census, 82 percent of Arab-Americans graduated from high school, while more than half, 52 percent had at least a college degree and a full 15 percent held some form of graduate degree. Furthermore 36.4 percent, more than one-third, of Arab-Americans are represented in managerial positions or the professions.

However, it is difficult for any ethnic group to enjoy full acceptance and assimilation if they remain targets of scorn or if people of their heritage are employed as negative symbols. Whenever someone is insulted for being "stupid" or "lazy" or "fanatical"—

"just like" people of a certain ethnic group—we reinforce the notion that all the members of the ethnic group so referenced are a people who are stupid or lazy or fanatic. The result is ethnic division, bad feelings and unfounded prejudice.

That is what Mr. McCurry's statement does. Moreover, invoking as it does the prestige of the White House inevitably will heighten anti-Arab feelings in this country and place an unfair burden on people who are hard-working, loyal, tax paying citizens.

Finally, I am concerned about Mr. McCurry's statement because it seems clear to me that a Presidential Press Secretary, whose salary is paid for by the taxpayers, should not engage in such blatantly partisan activity.

I am not here supporting Pat Buchanan's run for the Presidency. But in my view Mr. McCurry stepped over an important line when he attacked Mr. Buchanan in the way he did. The American people are not paying Mr. McCurry so that he can make insensitive stereotyping statements intended, among other things, to help his boss' chances in the next election.

The President has many avenues available to him if he wishes to make campaign statements. He also has the option of going through the steps necessary to make an open bid for reelection. Within this context it would be understandable that his campaign spokesman would make partisan statements.

But to have a public employee making such blatantly political attacks, capitalizing on the media access and prestige of the Presidency for purely political ends, is simply unacceptable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOUTH DAKOTA GRANITE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt once called Mount Rushmore "the shrine of American democracy."

Because of his love of that shrine, it is especially fitting that, as we approach the 50th anniversary of FDR's death on April 12, the new memorial that is being built now in our Nation's Capital to honor President Roosevelt will be carved, like Mount Rushmore, out of South Dakota stone.

There is another reason that South Dakota rock is being used for the memorial. It is, as geologists will tell you, quite simply one of the most beautiful granites in the world.

It is called carnelian granite, named for the warm, mahogany color of the

rock. It has been quarried in Milbank, in the northeast corner of South Dakota, since 1908.

Because of its rich color and brilliant shine, Milbank granite has been used for public monuments in nearly every State and Canada. In Pierre, the capital of South Dakota, it was used in 1912 to build our statehouse. In Washington, it was used to build the National Catholic Shrine and the poignant memorial to the women who fought in the war in Vietnam.

The Roosevelt Monument, which will be completed in spring 1997, will use 135,000 square feet of Milbank granite. That is about as much granite as you would need to construct an 80-story building.

The memorial will depict 12 pivotal years in America's history through a series of four rooms, each devoted to one of FDR's four terms in office. The granite from my home State will form the walls of those rooms, into which will be carved President Roosevelt's own inspiring words. Among the bronze sculptures to inhabit the rooms will be a statue of Eleanor Roosevelt, a champion of women's rights, who had a profound effect on FDR and on this Nation.

Like Theodore Roosevelt before him, Franklin Roosevelt was always a little awe-struck by the stark beauty of the American West, and particularly South Dakota. In 1944, he suggested that the United Nations be located in the Black Hills of South Dakota so that world leaders might ponder the profound solitude and the magnificence of the Earth as they faced tough issues.

South Dakota is a land of awe-inspiring geological resources: the Black Hills, the Badlands, vast caves and glacial deposits, and of course, the 2½ billion-year-old Milbank granite.

Among the oldest rocks in the world, the South Dakota granite will produce a tribute to geological, almost infinite, duration to an extraordinary President who led this Nation through the depths of the Depression and the horrors of the Second World War to a far better place.

In 1936 when FDR came to Mount Rushmore to preside at the dedication of Jefferson's likeness, he said "we can mediate and wonder what our descendants will think about us 10,000 years from now when they see this mountain."

We in South Dakota are proud that future generations will gaze upon the rock of South Dakota when they reflect on the lasting contributions to American society of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is especially appropriate that we honor President Roosevelt now.

There are people in Washington who truly hope and aspire to the great things that President Roosevelt had wanted and to which he dedicated his life. But the fundamental ideals in which President Roosevelt believed—fairness, genuine opportunity for all Americans—go beyond Democratic and